



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/090,739	03/06/2002	Thomas Layne Bascom	12402	5257
27082	7590	08/10/2005	EXAMINER	
DORSEY & WHITNEY LLP 1001 PENNSYLVANIA AVENUE, N.W. SUITE 400 SOUTH WASHINGTON, DC 20004			STORK, KYLE R	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2178	

DATE MAILED: 08/10/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

**Office Action Summary**

Application No.

10/090,739

Applicant(s)

BASCOM ET AL.

Examiner

Kyle R. Stork

Art Unit

2178

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 04 June 2005.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-7, 14-16, 18, 19 and 22-49 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-7, 14-16, 18, 19 and 22-49 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119**

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

**Attachment(s)**

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. \_\_\_\_\_
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_

### **DETAILED ACTION**

1. This final office action is in response to the amendment filed 4 June 2005.
2. Claims 1-7, 14-16, 18-19, and 22-49 are pending. Claims 8-13, 17, and 20-21 are cancelled by the amendment. Claims 33-49 are added by the amendment. Claims 1 and 28 are independent claims. The rejection of claims 24-25 and 32 under 35 U.S.C. 103 have been withdrawn as necessitated by the amendment.

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112***

3. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:  

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.
4. Claims 1-7, 14-16, 18-19, 22-27 and 33-49 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Claim 1 recites the limitation "the assignment of attributes" in 8. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

Claim 39 recites the limitation "the assignment of the second attribute" in line 1. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

Claims 2-7, 14-16, 18-19, 22-27, 33-38, and 40-49 are rejected for dependence upon a rejected base claim.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. Claims 1, 2, 4, 6-7, 16, 18-19 and 28-29 remain rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Goerz, Jr. et al. (herein after Goerz) U.S. Patent Pub No. 2002/0065671 filed 1/30/2001, in view of Sandra E. Eddy et al. (herein after Eddy), "Teach Yourself XML" IDG Books Worldwide, Inc., Foster City, CA 1999.

In regard to independent claim 1, Goerz discloses creating one or more link directories for storing link relationships between document objects located on the network (Goerz Para 0071); enabling the creation of a link relationships between a first document object located on the network and a second document object located on the network (Goerz Para 0005-0007); a unique identifier that locates a document object on the network (Goerz Para 0005-0007: Here a URL is a unique identifier used to locate a document object on a network).

Goerz does not specially disclose allowing the assignment of attributes describing the link relationships. However Eddy discloses allowing the assignment of attributes describing the link relationships (Page 311, code listing 21-10). It would have

been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to apply Eddy to Goerz, providing Goerz the benefit of creating link relationships to enable a user to use a link to choose from several locations as taught by Eddy Page 303 paragraph 1.

In regard to dependent claim 2, Goerz discloses the method further comprising the steps of storing the link relationships with the attributes in the one or more link directories located on the network separate from the document objects. (Goerz Para 0084 and 0085)

In regard to dependent claim 4, Goerz discloses wherein the method further comprises permitting users of the network to access the one or more link directories (Goerz Para 0071 and Para 0114 claim 1)

In regard to dependent claim 6, Goerz discloses the method assigning one or more attributes to one of the document objects (Goerz Para Figure 19I-19K).

In regard to dependent claim 7, Goerz discloses assigning one or more attributes associated to the first document object; assigning one or more attributes to the second document object; and creating a link relationship described by a relationship between the assigned attribute for the first document object and the assigned attribute for the second document object. (Goerz Figures 19I-19K and Figure 19M-19P)

In regard to dependent claim 16, Goerz discloses wherein one of the link relationship attributes identifies the creator of the link relationship. (Goerz Para 0071 and Figure 17 i.e. login identifies a user)

In regard to dependent claim 18, Goerz discloses wherein one of the attributes identifies an entity responsible for a document object. (Goerz Para 0071) (Goerz Para 0042 and 0043) (Goerz Para 0041 and 0058)

In regard to dependent claim 19, Goerz discloses further comprising presenting to a user link references to document objects associated with the responsible entity. (Goerz Para 0042 and 0043) (Goerz Para 0041 and 0058)

In regard to independent claim 28, claim 28 reflects similar subject matter claimed in claim 1 and is rejected along the same rationale.

In regard to dependent claim 29, Goerz discloses defining one or more link relationship attributes describing the link relationships stored in the one or more link directories (Goerz Figure 19I); and assigning one or more link relationship attributes to each link relationship, wherein the one or more assigned link relationship attributes describe the link relationship as determined by the user assigning the link relationship attributes (Goerz Figure 19I-19K); and storing the link relationships with the attributes in the one or more link directories located on the network. (Goerz Para 0084 and 0085)

5. Claims 3, 5, 14-15, 22-23, 26-27, and 30-31 remain rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Goerz, Jr. et al. (herein after Goerz) in view of Sandra E. Eddy et al. (herein after Eddy) as applied to claim 1 and in further view of LeMole et al. (herein after LeMole) U.S. Patent No. 6,009,410 filed 10/16/1997.

In regard to dependent claim 3, Goerz does not specifically disclose creating one or more user profiles, wherein the one or more user profiles specify one or more link

directories and one or more attributes relevant to a user's interests; applying the one or more user profiles as filters against the one or more retrieved link relationships to determine which link relationships to present to the user; and presenting the retrieved and filtered link relationships to the user while the user is accessing a document object. However, LeMole discloses a similar process (LeMole Abstract). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to apply LeMole to Goerz, providing Goerz the benefit of creating user profiles to return links to the user, which are related to their profile and interest.

In regard to dependent claim 5, Goerz discloses wherein the presenting step comprises ordering the link relationships presented to the user by link directories and by discrete attributes describing the link relationships. (Goerz Figures 19I-19K and Figure 19M-19P)

In regard to dependent claim 14, Goerz discloses wherein the managing step further comprises permitting the user to identify link directories containing link relationships to the document object the user is accessing. (Goerz Para 0042 and 0043)

In regard to dependent claim 15, Goerz discloses further comprising permitting the identification of link relationships assigned a particular attribute. (Goerz Para 0042 and 0043) (Goerz Para 0047 and 0089)

In regard to dependent claim 22, Goerz discloses wherein the managing step further comprises presenting a user of the network accessing a link relationship with an identity of a creator of the link relationship. (Goerz Para 0071) (Goerz Para 0042 and 0043) (Goerz Para 0041 and 0058)

In regard to dependent claim 23, Goerz discloses wherein the step of presenting the retrieved and filtered link relationships is restricted to authorized users. (Goerz Para 0071) (Goerz Para 0042 and 0043) (Goerz Para 0041 and 0058)

In regard to dependent claim 26, Goerz discloses wherein the managing step further comprises permitting users to specify a value or range of values for a selected attribute used to filter the retrieved link relationships. (Goerz Para 0047 and 0089)

In regard to dependent claim 27, Goerz does not specifically disclose wherein the link relationship created in the enabling step comprises a link reference including a network address containing a bookmark. However, LeMole discloses bookmarks that are used (LeMole Col 4 Lines 15-25 and Col 6 Lines 51-60). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to apply LeMole to Goerz, providing Goerz the benefit of using bookmark so the user can keep track of the links.

In regard to dependent claim 30, claim 30 reflects similar subject matter claimed in claim 3 and is rejected along the same rationale.

In regard to dependent claim 31, claim 31 reflects similar subject matter claimed in claim 5 and is rejected along the same rationale.

5. Claims 24-25, and 32-49 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Goerz in view of Eddy and in further view of Fowler et al. (UML Distilled Second Edition: A Brief Guide to the Standard Object Modeling Language, 2000, hereafter Fowler).



In regard to dependent claim 24, Goerz discloses wherein the allowing step further comprises defining valid data types associated with each link relationship attribute. (Goerz Para 0041-0043)

In regard to dependent claim 25, Goerz discloses further comprising validating link relationship attributes assigned by users, the validating comprising matching defined valid data types to values assigned to the link relationship attributes by users. (Goerz Para 0041-0043)

In regard to dependent claim 32, Goerz does not specifically disclose a list of attributes. However, Fowler discloses a list of attributes (page 50). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention to apply Fowler to Goerz and Eddy, since it would have allowed a user to describe the type of objects in a system and the relationships between them (Fowler: page 49, paragraph 3).

In regard to dependent claim 33, claim 33 reflects similar subject matter claimed in claim 32 and is rejected along the same rationale.

In regard to dependent claim 34, Fowler discloses assigning attributes from the list of attributes (page 57: Here, the list of attributes can have values assigned to the listed attributes). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention to apply Fowler to Goerz, Eddy, and Fowler, since it would have allowed a user to set information about an attribute (Fowler: page 50, paragraph 3).

In regard to dependent claim 35, Fowler discloses assigning attributes from the list of attributes (page 57: Here, a field is a list of values associated with an attribute). It

would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention to apply Fowler to Goerz, Eddy, and Fowler, since it would have allowed a user to store data related to an attribute (Fowler: page 50).

In regard to dependent claim 36, Fowler discloses assigning attribute values from the list of attribute values from the list of attribute values (page 50, paragraph 6: Here, an attribute can either optional or mandatory. Each attribute contains this value association). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention to apply Fowler to Goerz, Eddy, and Fowler, since it would have allowed a user to include data if convenient (Fowler: page 50).

In regard to dependent claim 37, Fowler discloses automatically inheriting the benefit of the context of the associated attribute (page 50: Here, a user does not need to specify if an attribute is mandatory or optional, however the attribute automatically inherits the context). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention to apply Fowler to Goerz, Eddy, and Fowler, since it would have allowed a user to include data only if convenient (Fowler: page 50).

In regard to dependent claim 38, Fowler discloses declaring that a first attribute is subordinate to a second attribute (pages 44-45: Here, an attribute associated through an *include* statement is subordinate to the included attribute). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention to apply Fowler to Goerz, Eddy, and Fowler, since it would have allowed a user to avoid repetitions (Fowler: page 45).

In regard to dependent claim 39, Fowler discloses the assignment of an attribute automatically inherits the benefit of the context of being subordinate to the attribute (pages 44-45 and 50). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention to apply Fowler to Goerz, Eddy, and Fowler, since it would have allowed a user to avoid repetitions (Fowler: page 45).

In regard to dependent claim 40, Fowler discloses dependency (page 91). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention to apply Fowler to Goerz, Eddy, and Fowler, since it would have allowed a user specify associations (Fowler: page 57, paragraph 1).

In regard to dependent claim 41, claim 41 reflects similar subject matter claimed in claim 39 and is rejected along the same rationale.

In regard to dependent claim 42, Fowler discloses declaring an attribute from the list of attributes is subordinate to an attribute value from the list of attribute values (pages 44-45 and 50: Here, attribute relationships allow for attributes to subordinate). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention to apply Fowler to Goerz, Eddy, and Fowler, since it would have allowed a user specify associations (Fowler: page 57, paragraph 1).

In regard to dependent claim 43, Fowler discloses identifying a first attribute; identifying a second attribute; creating a pair attribute that further describes a link relationship described by the first and second attribute (page 56: Here, attributes are related). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the

applicant's invention to apply Fowler to Goerz, Eddy, and Fowler, since it would have allowed a user to link objects (page 57).

In regard to dependent claim 44, Fowler discloses declaring pair attribute values further describing one or more pair attributes (page 91: Here, a dependency describes a pair). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention to apply Fowler to Goerz, Eddy, and Fowler, since it would have allowed a user specify associations (Fowler: page 57, paragraph 1).

In regard to dependent claim 45, Fowler discloses assigning the pair attribute to the link relationship described by the first attribute and the second attribute (page 91: Here, a dependency describes a pair). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention to apply Fowler to Goerz, Eddy, and Fowler, since it would have allowed a user specify associations (Fowler: page 57, paragraph 1).

In regard to dependent claim 46, Fowler discloses assigning a pair attribute value to the link relationship described by the first attribute and the second attribute (page 91: Here, a dependency describes a pair). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention to apply Fowler to Goerz, Eddy, and Fowler, since it would have allowed a user specify associations (Fowler: page 57, paragraph 1).

In regard to dependent claim 47, Fowler discloses declaring that one or more attributes from the list of attributes is required to be assigned (page 57). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention to

apply Fowler to Goerz, Eddy, and Fowler, since it would have allowed a user to indicate mandatory attributes (Fowler: page 57).

In regard to dependent claim 48, Fowler discloses declaring that an attribute must be assigned when another attribute is assigned (pages 44-45: Here, *include* requires certain attributes to be related in the fashion that if one is present, the included attribute is also present). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention to apply Fowler to Goerz, Eddy, and Fowler, since it would have allowed a user to avoid repetitions (Fowler: page 45).

In regard to dependent claim 49, Goerz does not specifically disclose permitting the identification of document objects assigned a particular attribute. However, Fowler discloses permitting the identification of document objects assigned a particular attribute (page 93: Here, a Customer object contains the same attributes and associations). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention to apply Fowler to Goerz and Eddy, since it would have allowed a user to have changes made to one object apply to all similar objects (Fowler: page 93).

### ***Response to Arguments***

6. Applicant's arguments filed 4 June 2005, with respect to claims 1-23 and 26-31, have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

The applicant argues that Goerz fails to disclose retrieving links using a unique identifier for a document object (page 11). However, the examiner respectfully

disagrees. Goerz discloses the use of a URL (paragraphs 0005-0006). A URL is a unique identifier disclosing the location of a document object on a network.

7. Applicant's arguments with respect to claim 24-25 and 32-49 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

As disclosed above, the Fowler reference has been added to address the amended limitations.

### ***Conclusion***

8. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than **SIX MONTHS** from the date of this final action.


Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Kyle R. Stork whose telephone number is (571) 272-4130. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday (8:00-4:30).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Stephen Hong can be reached on (571) 272-4124. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Kyle Stork  
Patent Examiner  
Art Unit 2178

hrs

  
CESAR PAULA  
PRIMARY EXAMINER